





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS





*from the author*

# CHARGE

DELIVERED TO

THE CLERGY AND CHURCHWARDENS OF THE  
DIOCESE OF BATH AND WELLS,

AT THE

GENERAL VISITATION HELD IN APRIL AND MAY, 1873.

BY

ARTHUR CHARLES, BISHOP OF BATH & WELLS.

*With Appendix.*

LONDON :

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

THOMAS GREEN, WELLS.

1873.

LONDON.

BRADBURY AGNEW, & CO., PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

## CHARGE.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

MY BRETHREN THE CHURCHWARDENS,

I am glad to feel that after three years of constant residence in the diocese, I am not now a stranger addressing strangers. With the help of our Diocesan conferences, frequent church and school openings, confirmations, missions, and intercourse of various kinds, both personal and by letter, we are, I trust, sufficiently acquainted with each other to establish relations of confidence and kindly feeling. I shall address to you to-day what I have to say, in the full persuasion that I shall have a friendly hearing, and that if in anything your own opinions may not coincide with mine, distrust and suspicion, at least, will not be mingled with your dissent.

The altered condition of society generally at the present day, compared with that which existed in the early ages of Christianity and for many subsequent centuries, has greatly modified and changed the uses of Episcopal Visitations. Many purposes, such as inquiry into abuses, or errors in doctrine or practice, obtaining information as to the state of Churches, Schools, and other Parochial matters, and so on, are now compassed by other agencies which our improved civilization enables us to employ; while in an age when everybody thinks and judges for himself, it is obvious that mere authority must have lost much of its influence.

Indeed, in some quarters, it seems to be thought that the highest Christian duty is to vilify and vituperate those in authority, and that whatever is said or done by a Bishop of the English Church must needs be either wicked or foolish, or both. Certain, however, it is that the growth of democracy in Church as well as State, which I take to be the inevitable result of the equalizing influence of high civilization, weakens what I may call the arbitrary power of authority, and has a tendency to diminish even its legitimate influence. As, however, the existence of authority in some form is necessary in every body of men, and certainly in the Church, it seems to me that what authority loses of its direct power under the altered circumstances of which I have spoken, it should try to make up by the increase of two great forces—the one that of Christian love binding men's hearts in a willing subjection to the rule instituted by the Lord JESUS: the other that of reason addressing reason, and, if it may be, binding the intellect, and working a consent of judgment. A visitation offers an opportunity more or less for both these methods of strengthening the Bishop's influence. On the one hand, in worshipping together, in breaking Bread together at the Lord's Table, and in friendly intercourse afterwards, Christian and kindly feelings are promoted; and, on the other hand, in his Charge a Bishop can state his views and opinions on matters of interest to the Church, calmly and candidly, and if there is in them the weight of reason and good sense, he has a good hope that the sensible and candid portion of his hearers will give him a fair hearing, and yield to the influence of truth. Only there must be on the Bishop's part perfect freedom of speech, and fearlessness in saying what he thinks, whether it is likely to please or to displease either the clergy or the laity. His one object must be, not to curry favour or court popularity with either high or low, cleric or laic, but to state openly what, after due consideration, he believes to be the truth, and to be for the

real and lasting welfare of the Church to be spoken. His trust will be in the good sense and Christian charity of his hearers to take kindly what is spoken honestly, and to weigh impartially even what is most contrary to their own opinions or prejudices.

To begin with what is uppermost in my own mind. I earnestly desire to see the Church in this Diocese pure, strong, active, and united. Whatever was the intention of our Lord that His Church on earth should be, whatever has been the practice of the Church in her best days in accordance with our Lord's will and ordinance, that I desire with my whole heart should be carried out among us. Private interests, private tastes, private opinions, whether my own or other people's, I would utterly disregard. Personal considerations, political considerations, social considerations, I would have stand on one side, while the inquiry is simply, "What has the Lord ordained? and what is the Lord's pleasure in regard to His Church as He looks down upon her from the throne of His Glory?" To much of this inquiry the answer is obvious and certain. And I would press the answer home to the individual conscience of each of us. The will of the Lord is that each of us, whether lay or clerical, should be contributing to the utmost of his power to the welfare of the body of which we are members. It is no mean privilege to be a member of the Church of God, of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the Head, and which is animated by His Spirit. In this body there are many members, and every member has not the same office, but they are all alike members of the Body, and every member has *an* office, under the great Head. My conception then of what the Church in our own Diocese should be is, that all of us, Bishop, clergy, laymen of every rank and degree, whether churchwardens and other church-officers, or private members, gentlemen, farmers, manufacturers, tradesmen, artisans, labourers, should each and all realize our position as members of the

Church of Christ ; as such be thoroughly united in heart and soul ; as such be each seeking, first and above all, the strength and welfare of the Church. There is no position so high in regard to wealth, or rank, or learning, but that simple membership in the Church of God is an honour higher than any of those things can confer, and entails duties and responsibilities higher than they involve. And there is no position in life so humble but that he who holds it is privileged, if he is a member of Christ's Church, to bear his part in all that concerns the well-being of that Church. I say again, therefore, that my ideal of the Church is the close and thorough union of all ranks and all classes in doing the Church's work. I should like to feel that while all were pursuing their lawful calling, some in the town and some in the country, some in the office and some in the shop, some in the factory and some in the field, there was in all the same solemn sense of Church-membership, uniting all in a real brotherhood, drawing the loving thoughts of all to CHRIST the common Head of all, and making all more really solicitous for the weal of the Church, than for their private interests, or their private opinions : and in all the same stamp and seal of their membership, a life of truth, purity, holiness, and unselfish love.

In aiming at such a result as this, in desiring our Diocese to exhibit such features as these, we may be sure that our wishes and our endeavours are in accordance with the Lord's will. And I ask the co-operation of all in the endeavour to bring such a state of things about. And let me add that all who have this common aim, and pursue it with singleness of eye, whatever differences of opinion they may have, ought to be firmly joined together by the cement of brotherly love.

But in this world it is necessary to pass out of the region of thought and theory into that of action and practice. The Church must have an outward organization. She must have a material framework. She must have rules, a mode of *θρησκεία*,

an outward and visible Religion, a system, a government, a certain polity and order. These may be conceived as very various, even given the common aim of glory to God, and righteousness in men. Obviously too, as regards all the parts of the Church system which are merely human and secondary, a considerable variety is, in the nature of things, both expedient and necessary, according to the varying conditions of numbers, civil government, civilization, public opinion, education, and so on, with which the Church is brought into relation in different ages and different countries of the world.

The matter then stands thus. The doctrine of the Church, and those essential parts of her ritual which, like the doctrine, are not of human but of divine origin, are unchangeable. They are for all time, for all place, and for all circumstances. But the rules and canons and rubrics of the Church, and numberless details relating to her officers, her buildings, her revenues, her ceremonies, her discipline, do vary and ought to vary, and must vary, according to the circumstances of the civil society with which the Church is connected by time and place.

But then come the important practical questions.

I. What is the authority by which the unchangeable portions of the Church's teaching (whether doctrine or ritual) is established. And

II. What is the authority by which changes may lawfully be made in that which in its nature is changeable?

I. The Church's unchangeable doctrine and ritual rests solely upon the authority of Her Divine and Infallible Head, Jesus Christ our Lord, as set forth for the Church's perpetual use in Holy Scripture. The doctrine concerning God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the doctrine of the Incarnation, the Atoning Sacrifice, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the coming to Judge and Reign of the Son of God, the doctrine of the gift of the Holy Ghost, the doctrine of Baptism

and of the Lord's Supper, are all revealed truths, which stand fast for ever and ever, and are like the Mount Zion, which may not be moved. There are also many other things which, though standing as it were on a lower pedestal, have yet the authority either of Christ Himself, or of His Apostles speaking and acting by His Holy Spirit. I mean such as ordination, marriage, public prayers, preaching, missionary labours, alms-giving, fasting, and such like. These all derive their authority from Christ Himself, either immediately or mediately through the Apostles inspired by His Spirit, and are contained in, or may be proved by, Holy Scripture. It is, I conceive, a fundamental principle of Christianity itself, and is distinctly laid down in the Articles of Religion, that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation" (Art. vi.) The audacious attempt to set up as articles of faith things not read in Holy Scripture, nor to be proved thereby, is anti-Christian and impious. In the interpretation, however, of Holy Scripture, the ministry and witness of the Church is invaluable. When we have distinct evidence of universal consent in the Churches say of the three first centuries, as to the doctrine of Holy Scripture on any point, it forms a weight of argument as to what the true meaning of Holy Scripture is, which none but the most presumptuous and arrogant will despise. The consent, for instance, of the universal Church in the Articles of the Nicene Creed, the universal practice of Infant Baptism from the Apostolic age, the universal diffusion over the whole world of a ministry consisting of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons—these, I say, are such evidence of how the first Churches understood and received the teaching of Holy Scripture on these several points, as it is impossible to over-rate. But for all that, we hold these things upon the authority of scripture. *Ecclesia docet, Scriptura probat.* And I may take this opportunity of insisting on the great value of really Apostolic tradition. No wise or prudent theologian will discard its use, or undervalue

its importance. It is almost as efficient in testing the truth of doctrines as Holy Scripture itself. *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, is a sound test of Catholic truth. But it is a test as fatal to the innovations and corruptions of the fourth or fifth centuries, as to those of the twelfth or nineteenth centuries. The power claimed for the Church to broach doctrines not contained in Holy Scripture, or, in other words, the co-ordinate authority of the Church to teach truths not revealed in Holy Scripture, but supposed to be revealed to her by the Holy Spirit in these latter days, is a thing totally different in kind from her testimony to the true meaning of Holy Scripture: and the value even of this testimony depends upon its being unbroken from the times of the Apostles. Let me repeat it then, the sole authority by which the unchangeable portions of the Church's doctrine and ritual are established, is the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, as set forth in Holy Scripture for the Church's perpetual use. But

II. There are in the nature of things a number of rules, practices, ordinances, ceremonies, formularies, which are not contained in Holy Scripture, and which vary, and ought to vary, and must vary, in different ages, and in different countries. By whom, and on what authority, are such changes in ritual, in dress, in ceremonies, in prayers, in rules and regulations, to be made? Surely it is self-evident that, as the thirty-fourth article says, "every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying;" but that "whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church . . . which be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly." The Church of England, when she cast off the usurped authority of the Pope of Rome, and with it the corruptions and errors of more than a thousand years, and

resumed her inherent right, as a Church, to regulate her own affairs, did deliberately, and painfully, and circumspectly, determine and decree what ceremonies, rites, traditions, and customs she would retain, and what it was for the edification of the Church that she should reject. And the result of her collective wisdom, ratified by lawful authority in Church and State, we have in her Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the Sacraments. That Book, with the Thirty-nine Articles, is the voice of the English Church. To it every Priest and Deacon is bound by the most solemn declarations and promises, to yield a hearty obedience. Not his own private opinion, but the voice of the Prayer Book, is in all such things his rule and guide. Not the practice of the Western Church, *i.e.*, the Church of Rome, not the canons and rules of churches in Asia, or Gaul, or Africa, a thousand years ago, but the Canons and Rules and Rubries of the Church of England, actually in force, are the authority which he is bound to obey. For an English Churchman to disobey his Prayer Book, on the plea of a so-called Catholic usage which his Church has rejected, and to endeavour, by sheer obstinacy, to overrule the provisions which he has sworn to obey, and to substitute others for them, is to my apprehension a plain act of immorality, and contrary to all principles of true churchmanship.

I have thought it right to speak thus plainly, because it is notorious that there are those in the Church at the present day who have deliberately and avowedly undertaken the task of revolutionizing the Church of England as to her doctrine and her ritual, and of effecting her reunion with the Church of Rome. There is scarcely a single doctrine of that corrupt communion which it has not been attempted of late to bring back among us. The depreciation of the Bible as the rule of faith, and the exaltation of the Church as a fountain of revelation; the mass as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and dead; solitary masses as sacrifices by which non-communi-

cants are benefited; such a local presence of the Lord Jesus in the consecrated elements as to be a proper object of worship, a worship directed to the elements as containing Him; the invocation and worship of the Virgin Mary, and prayers for her intercession; auricular confession and priestly absolution; penance; purgatory, and so on, not one of which was taught or practised in the Anti-Nicene Church. And, together with these, have been introduced a whole host of practices of a minor kind, all savouring of Romanism, and intended to familiarise the Anglican worshipper with Roman ways. The English priests and deacons are to be dressed as like as possible to Romish priests and deacons; the church choristers are to be as like as possible to the acolytes and choristers in a Romish church; the Lord's table is to be made and dressed as like as possible to the altar of a Romish church; the chants and music are to be as like as possible to those in the Church of Rome; the processions, banners, crosses, and crucifixes, of Romish ceremonials, are to be exactly imitated; the Roman use of incense and wafer bread is to be adopted; in short, in everything Anglican worship is to be assimilated as closely as possible to the worship in Belgian, Italian, and other Romish churches. Then, again, we are introduced to a variety of supplements to the Prayer Book. Offices are provided for the consecration of portable altars, for the benediction of church bells, for the consecration of chrism and holy oil with which to anoint the sick, for the blessing of altar-cloths, corporals, patens, pyxes, albs, chasubles, &c. We have offices, too, for the admission of novices, male and female; for the profession of brothers and sisters; for the installation of superiors of brotherhoods, and mother superiors of sisterhoods; and we have a great variety of litanies, for the dead as well as for the living, all as unlike the litany of the Church as it is possible to conceive. There are offices, too, for the blessing of salt and water. And the priest (*i. e.*,

the English clergyman) is to throw the salt into the water in the form of a cross, saying, “ Let this mixture be made in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” And there are offices for blessing candles for Candlemas day, and for blessing ashes for Ash Wednesday, and for blessing palms and flowers for Palm Sunday; and there are benedictions of service books, of thuribles, of incense, of tapers, of crucifixes, of medals, of church banners, &c. We are also favoured with works which pass through two or more editions, in which, among other things, the clergy are instructed as to what is necessary to a devout celebration and communion. Among them I find that he ought not to wash his teeth in the morning before he communicates, for fear of drinking a drop of water, and so breaking his fast, nor to cough afterwards; and that it is the celebrant’s duty to rinse out the chalice after celebration, and to pour water over his fingers into the chalice, and then to drink the water, with much more of the same kind, which it is sickening to mention. Another method largely used for familiarising the English churchman’s mind with Roman Catholic doctrine, is the introduction and recommendation on a large scale of Roman Catholic books of devotion, and especially books connected with confession, and with the (so-called) sacrifice of the altar. The mind is thus familiarised with the teaching of Liguori, and Ignatius Loyola, and with breviaries and missals, and alienated from the language of the Anglican Prayer Book and the doctrines of the Anglican Church.

All this, together with the tone used by certain writers, and the endeavour to hoot down those who resist the attempt to Romanise the Church of England, as if they were not true churchmen, but ignorant, uncatholic dissenters, convinces me that there is a deliberate conspiracy on foot somewhere to bring back the Church of England to communion with, and obedience to, the Pope of Rome. Indeed, if all these doctrines and prac-

tices which I have detailed are and ought to be the practices and doctrines of the English Church, I am at a loss to know on what grounds our separation from Rome can be justified. The question of the precise degree of authority to be exercised by the Bishop of Rome over the Western Churches is hardly one of sufficient importance to create a great schism; the difference between the doctrine of transubstantiation and that taught by the new school is absolutely insignificant in the region of religion: and there is no other important question at issue, that I am aware of, between Rome and England. So that we are brought face to face with the question, Shall the Church of England return to her allegiance to the Church of Rome? Shall the mighty Revolution of the 16th century be undone, and shall we have a Restoration? a restoration of the Popedom on British soil? a restoration of all those corruptions, those follies, those idolatries, those perversions of the truth, those wretched debasing superstitions, and that priestly tyranny, which for so many centuries almost quenched the light of Christianity, and annihilated the liberties of the laity? Shall we exchange our Prayer Books for breviaries and missals; close our Bibles and take up with the lives of saints, or the "Garden of the Soul;" in a word, submit to the decrees of the Council of Trent, and the last *Œcumene*ical Council of Rome?

If we are not prepared to do this, if we are determined, by God's grace, to stand to the Reformation, and if we are satisfied that such teaching as that of which I have given specimens is not in harmony with the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, and with the doctrine which the Apostles, illuminated by the Holy Ghost, delivered to the churches all over the world, nor with the doctrine for which the fathers of the English Reformation laid down their lives, and which they have handed down to us, then it is time for us to make a stand against the attempt to reimpose Popery upon the English Church. We must not allow ourselves to drift gradually and unconsciously into the

communion of Rome. We must not be like the silly daughters of Pelias, and allow our Church to be dismembered, limb by limb, in the vain hope that in the hands of our modern Medeas she will come forth in renewed youth and beauty. And I appeal to you, my brethren of the clergy, and to you, my brethren of the laity, to help in withstanding the astounding growth of that spirit which gives birth to the kind of religion which I have described.

I believe that the most efficient barrier that can be raised against Popery is the doctrine, rightly understood, and the system fully carried out, of the English Church. Popery is a very compact and vigorous system, administered with great ability, having the prestige of vast power and dignity, and of a mighty and long-sustained empire; having on its side the authority of many illustrious names, aye and the adhesion of many very holy men and women; having a long pedigree and the weight of antiquity, and a large mixture of truth with its deadly errors, and the support of much theological learning, and of much devotion and piety on its behalf. No random religion, stones without mortar, separate doctrines loosely piled together, will ever be able to stand against it. It is not the individual piety that may be found amongst our dissenters, nor the ill-regulated fanaticism of our Plymouth Brethren, nor the rationalistic views of those among us who *Germanise*, that can oppose an effectual barrier to its progress. The Church of England, with her apostolic ministry, her succession both of orders and sacraments, her firm hold of scriptural doctrine, her consent with primitive tradition and practice, her sober, sound, evangelical formularies cast in the very mould of primitive antiquity, her determined rejection of the superstitious inventions of men, with the steady support and maintenance given her by the power of the Crown and the law of the land, has hitherto opposed an effectual barrier to the usurpations and encroachments of Rome in this country. If she is materially

altered in any one of these respects, I greatly doubt her power to maintain such barrier. Her force of cohesion being destroyed, and her balance of doctrinal power being weakened, she would herself split up. A portion of her members would at once fall into Rome by inevitable gravitation ; a portion would join the different sects ; a portion would fall away into Socinianism and various grades of infidelity ; and the faithful remnant would be too feeble to make head against the swelling tide of Romanism.

It is, therefore, of the utmost moment to the cause of the true Christian faith, I mean to its maintenance in England, that we should all, clergy and laity, stand by the Church of England, and maintain the principles on which she is founded. To suppose that you can introduce into her the several doctrines, the practices, the dress, the ornaments, the ceremonies, the whole spirit of Rome, and yet maintain her separate from Rome, is a fond and silly dream. Unprotestantise the Church of England, and saturate her with what men are pleased to call (though most falsely) Catholic ritual and Catholic (as opposed to scriptural) doctrine, and to a certainty she will coalesce with Rome. I ask you all, therefore, to stand by the Church of England. Hold fast the two principles which I have enunciated as held by her. (1) That what is necessary to salvation, and unchangeable in her doctrine and ritual, rests upon **HOLY SCRIPTURE**, and can neither be added to, nor diminished. (2) That rites and ceremonies and formularies may be decreed or changed by the authority of each particular or national Church, and by none other. Hold fast these two principles and act upon them. You will then look to **Holy Scripture**, as interpreted by the Church, for all vital and saving doctrine ; and you will dutifully obey the laws and rubries of that branch of the Church of which you are members, instead of presuming to substitute for them the ceremonies or formularies of other Churches.

If there is any one doctrine more than another on which the reformed Church of England has made her meaning clear, it is the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. Following the language of Holy Scripture, she calls it by names which clearly evidence her conception of its real character, “the Lord’s Supper” and “the Holy Communion ;” and she calls the place whereon the elements of Bread and Wine are placed by the scriptural names of “the Table,” or “the Lord’s Table,” or “the Holy Table,” terms manifestly correlative to that of “the Lord’s Supper.” When, again, she calls it by the name of “the SACRAMENT of the Body and Blood of Christ,” though she uses a word not used in Scripture, yet she uses it only to describe a thing which is most clearly contained in Holy Scripture, viz. that the Bread which we break is the Communion of the Body of Christ, and that the cup of blessing which we bless is the Communion of the Blood of Christ (1 Cor. x. 16): for, according to the Church’s definition of a sacrament, it is an outward visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us. And still adhering closely to the language of Holy Scripture she teaches us that the faithful who receive the Bread and Wine in the Lord’s Supper do verily and indeed take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ. And so, over and over again, she teaches the same blessed truth, that Jesus Christ is our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament, and that those who “receive God’s creatures of Bread and Wine, according to Christ’s institution,” are “partakers of His most Blessed Body and Blood ;” and that we are to “feed upon Him in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving.” Here, then, is a complete, consistent doctrine, every word of which, deep and mysterious as it is, is fully borne out by Holy Scripture. But not one word in the English Prayer Book, any more than in the Bible, of Christ being offered in the Holy Eucharist as a sacrifice for sin. There is much about this sacrifice of Christ by the Priest in the Roman missal, and in the decrees and

catechism of the Council of Trent. And in the Romish Ordinal the Priest receives commission “to offer sacrifice for the quick and dead” (quoted by Bishop Fitzgerald, in his “Ministry of the Forgiveness of Sins,” p. 17). But all this is carefully excluded from the English Prayer Book. Moreover, all the great divines of the English Church, even those who are considered to hold the highest doctrine on the Eucharist (I mean such as Bishop Andrewes and Bishop Cosin, as the Bishop of Ely has shown\*), do carefully and pointedly repudiate and exclude the idea of the Eucharist being a proper sacrifice. “We will never admit (Bishop Andrewes wrote to Cardinal Bellarmine) that your Christ of Bread is sacrificed” at the Lord’s Table. And they deny the Presence of Christ being other than, as Bishop Cosin expresses it, “a sacramental, spiritual, true Presence to the souls of all that come faithfully to receive Him, according to His own institution, in that Holy Sacrament.” But not only is this new doctrine, which is now so vehemently forced down our throats as the only Catholic doctrine, which whoever believes not, is no Churchman, nor true Christian, not only is it utterly strange to the English Prayer Book, and to the whole body of standard divines of the English Church (Cranmer, and Ridley, and Parker, and Jewel, and Hooker, and Andrewes, and Hammond, and Beveridge, and Hall, &c), but it is equally strange to the early Church. Not one single ancient Liturgy speaks of Christ being offered as a sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, or makes such a notion possible; not one single Liturgy suggests the objective Presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, so as to be an object of worship; the bread and wine, indeed, are “offered,” but prior to consecration; and, as in our own Prayer Book, there is a sacrifice of thanksgiving and praise, and an offering of alms, and of men’s hearts and bodies to be a “reasonable, holy, and

\* “Sacrifice, Altar, Priest.” By Edward Harold, Bishop of Ely, printed for private circulation.

lively sacrifice" unto God, acceptable through the One sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, offered once for all ; but an offering of Christ under the form of Bread and Wine, as a sacrifice for quick and dead—NEVER—nor any adoration of Christ as being in the elements. And with the Liturgies agree the explanations of the Christian apologists of the second and third centuries. They explain to their heathen neighbours (to use the words of Athenagoras) that the greatest sacrifice the Christians can offer to God, is to know Him, and to lift up holy hands in prayer to Him ; for He delights in the unbloody sacrifice, and the reasonable service. And so Justin Martyr, in that well-known minute account of the Christian worship of the second century, tells us how, in the assemblies of Christians gathered from town and country, after the reading of the Scriptures, and prayers, and a sermon, bread and a cup of wine and water were brought to the president (the bishop or presiding priest), who thereupon gave thanks to God at length for his gifts, the people answering AMEN ; and then the deacons distributed to the faithful and regenerate the bread and wine for which thanks had thus been given : which bread and wine they received, not as common bread or common drink, but as the Body and Blood of Christ ; for, he says, as Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh by the Word of God, and had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so are we taught that that meat for which the thanksgiving was made with prayer in the word that proceeded from Christ, and by which also our own flesh and blood are nourished by assimilation, is the Body and Blood of the Incarnate Jesus : A passage very remarkable, both for its antiquity and the full and unreserved statement of the acts of Christian worship ; thus precluding the idea of any reserve or concealment, and therefore proving to demonstration that in the second century there was no notion of offering Christ in any sense as a sacrifice. Justin speaks, indeed, of offerings. But it is bread and wine before consecration, and praise and

glory to God, and alms, which are the oblations spoken of, and he places the essence of the service in the distribution and reception of the elements. This agrees exactly with the liturgies, and it agrees with the frequent expressions of Eusebius 150 years later; expressions equally full and copious, and purporting to describe, not his own private opinion, but the opinions and practices common to the whole Church of God. In these he tells us that Christians, under the New Testament, no longer offer the old sacrifices of burnt offerings and incense, but offer the pure, unbloody, and reasonable sacrifice of good works, and a holy life in their own homes, and a contrite heart, and the sacrifice of prayer and praise and thanksgiving, and the offering of themselves to the service of God. And in other passages, referring more directly to the Holy Eucharist, he associates the above-named unbloody and reasonable sacrifices with “the awful sacrifices of the Table of Christ,” which he explains by teaching us how the Church keeps up the CONSTANT MEMORY of the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ at His Table, by the symbols of His Body and Blood. For, says he, Christ having offered up to the Father his wonderful sacrifice of Himself for the salvation of us all, commanded us, instead of sacrifice (*ἀντὶ θυσίας*), to offer up to God a perpetual memory thereof. And in another remarkable passage, where he is summing up his explanation of what are the sacrifices of Christians under the New Testament, he says, “So then we do offer both sacrifice and incense: partly while we celebrate the *memory* of the *great sacrifice* in the mysteries instituted by him, and offer to God in holy hymns and prayers our eucharistic sacrifice of thanksgiving for our salvation, partly while we dedicate ourselves entirely to Him, and consecrate our souls and bodies to the Word, the High Priest of God.” This, then,\* on the authority of the learned Eusebius, was the doctrine of the universal Church about the year 300 A.D., and it is exactly the

\* Compare the service in the Apostol. Constit. in Bingham xv. ch. iii.

doctrine of the Church of England in the year 1873. The learned Bingham shows conclusively that the elevation of the Host, and the adoration of the elements, were not practised till the twelfth or thirteenth centuries after Christ. (Lib. xv. ch. v. § 5.) And yet the adoration of Christ, present under the form of bread and wine, and the elevation of the cup for the people to worship, is one of those "Catholic" usages which it is attempted to thrust upon the members of the Church of England! Well did Archbishop Cranmer say that removing all other corruptions in doctrine, so long as the Popish doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass remained, was but like topping and lopping a tree, or cutting down weeds, while the body (of the tree) was left standing, and the roots were in the ground. "They will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions."

I especially charge you, therefore, my Reverend Brethren, both in your preaching and in your mode of celebrating, to adhere strictly to the doctrine and rubrics of the Church of England, which you have solemnly promised to obey. Practise yourselves, and inculcate in others, as much faith, as much devotion, as much reverence, as much solemnity of feeling, and withal as much joy and thankfulness, as you will, at the Holy Table of the Lord. Inculcate, as they of old did, the reasonable service, the pure offering, the sacrifice of praise and of a contrite spirit, the self-consecration, the holy life, which God will accept through the offering of Christ's body and blood, but do not try and bring back errors which the Church of England has deliberately rejected, or superstitious practices which spring from them. Remember that your commission is limited to ministering "the Doctrine, and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same." And the good Lord own and bless your ministrations to the increase of His Holy Church!

And you, my brethren of the laity, see that you rise to a full

sense of your Christian responsibilities in all that relates to the service of God and His Holy worship. I believe that much of the excess in regard to ritual, and what is falsely called sacramental teaching, arises from the utter laxity, and neglect, and irreverence of times past. When our congregations thrust out the Baptismal service from its proper place into an empty church, and made a point of leaving the church in a body so soon as the time came for receiving the Holy Communion, thus seeming to pour contempt upon the two sacraments ordained by Christ himself, can we be surprised if those who were shocked at such apparent irreligion may have let their zeal run away with them? Is it, think you, a right condition of the Church, for nine-tenths of the adults of the congregation to be non-communicants? men and women, fathers and mothers of families, masters and mistresses of Christian households, never from year's end to year's end to come to the Lord's Table, never to commemorate the sacrifice of the death of Christ? Is it an edifying spectacle to see the very officers of the Church, the Churchwardens, the guardians of the Church's property, and in some degree of her discipline too, setting the example to the people of turning their backs upon the Lord's Supper? And yet this was very common, and perhaps is so still. And was not this enough, added to our communions three times a year, to rouse the indignation of our more zealous brethren, and urge them to some vehemence of action? If you of the laity think your clergy have been intemperate in their zeal, should you not accuse your own coldness and neglect of Holy things of being the cause of this want of moderation? If there had been frequent communions, and devout attendance, and the presence of rich and poor, old and young, men and women, at our altars, there would have been no room for all these novelties. Complaints of the mode of celebrating the Holy Communion come with a bad grace from those who never come to the Holy Communion at all. What weight, too, or what influence

ean the opinions or the wishes with regard to Divine service of those persons have, who show by their absence from the holiest and most vital services that they have no part nor lot in the matter. But take your proper place as the congregation of Christ's people, and you will soon find that your opinions and wishes have the weight which they will then deserve. No clergyman, however self-willed, can set at nought the feelings of a united and devout people.

I have dwelt too long, perhaps, upon this subject, but I hope you will excuse me, as I feel it to be one of vital importance to the well-being of the Church—that Church which, I can assure my brethren, I love as warmly as they do.

But I will now pass on to another subject on which you may, perhaps, expect to hear my opinion, as it has occupied so much of the public mind, and which has scarcely been considered in the light which strikes me as most important—I mean the use of the ATHANASIAN CREED.

And here let me at once say that I think the question how to deal with this creed is a most difficult one. But because it is a difficult one it ought to be handled very calmly and impartially. We have had too much discussion in the style of those controversialists of old who, for the space of about two hours, cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians. If, whatever side we take, we really want to get at truth, we must listen to, and candidly weigh, our opponent's arguments, and not on the one hand feel sure that we must be right, or on the other make sure that our opponent is either a bigot, or a Socinian, or an Atheist in disguise. There is much to be said on both sides of the question, and both parties may be equally animated with zeal for the truth of God and for the integrity of the Christian faith.

The observations which I shall make on the subject shall be few, and they shall be directed to these two points :

I. The expediency of using such a creed at all. And

## II. The propriety or expediency of the damnatory clauses.

On both points I shall rest the main stress of the argument on the practice of the Primitive Church.

I. Any one can see that the structure and method of the Athanasian Creed are wholly different from those of the two other creeds. Whereas the Apostle's and Nicene creeds contain short and pithy articles in which the heads of Christian doctrine are laid down chiefly in Scripture language, the creed of St. Athanasius is a diffuse and argumentative statement of the most abstruse points that can engage the attention of a theologian and a metaphysician. It is a statement, moreover, which very widely diverges from the language of Scripture in its attempts to explain the revelations of Holy Scripture. For the first 600 years of Christianity, at least, this creed did not exist, or was unknown. The universal Church of Christ diffused over the whole world was able to maintain the faith which she had received, against all gainsayers, without the aid of such a document. Early in the fourth century, however, the assaults made by the Arian deniers of Christ's deity were so vehement and so dangerous that it was thought necessary to have a more distinct expression of the faith of the Catholic Church on this vital doctrine than existed previously. Accordingly the Emperor Constantine the Great summoned that famous Council of Nice which gives its name to the Nicene creed. Three hundred and eighteen of the most eminent bishops from all quarters of the world, Europe, Asia, and Africa, met together at Nicæa in Bithynia, and they agreed upon the Nicene creed, the chief novelty of it being those clauses which express accurately the proper Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance (*ὁμοούσιον*) with the Father." These clauses, and especially the last phrase invented and supported by the great Athanasius, then a deacon in the church of Alexandria, were adopted by the whole Church, in general council

assembled, as the final decision of the Arian controversy, and the final expression of the Church's belief in the true Godhead of the Only Begotten Son. This creed was again promulgated by the General Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), with the additional clauses which follow the words "I believe in the Holy Ghost" in our present Nicene creed. And A.D. 431, at the third general council (that of Ephesus) the bishops assembled not only gave their assent to the confession of faith issued by the Council of Nice, but expressly forbade anyone to bring forward, or write, or compose any other creed besides that laid down by the Nicene fathers. And so matters remained, except that the additions made by the Council of Constantinople were by general consent adopted and incorporated into the Nicene Creed. But not only so. It is well known that the great leaders of the Catholic party, immediately after the Council of Nice, were most firmly opposed to any addition to or alteration of the Nicene Creed, and no one more so than Athanasius himself. Ceillier writes thus (he is showing the improbability of Athanasius being the author of the creed): "It is well known how firmly this holy bishop always opposed the making any fresh formulas of faith after those agreed upon at Nicaea, and how often he reproached the Arians with the great number and variety of their creeds. It is well known, also, that at the Council of Sardica he approved and signed the decree there passed that for the future no fresh creed should be made, for fear the Nicene creed should be thought imperfect and insufficient." As a matter of fact, no fresh symbol has ever since been enunciated by a general council of the Church, unless we admit those put forth at Trent and lately at Rome.

Well, then, here we have a decided opinion expressed both by general and also by particular councils, and warmly espoused and approved by no less a person than Athanasius himself, that the creed of the Council of Nice ought to be the final expression of the Church's faith, and that it is inexpedient in the

interests of the Church, and of the faith of which she is the keeper, to add any fresh formula to the Church's creed. I am no stickler for the infallibility of councils or of bishops, even though they be canonised. But, to say the least, they *may* have been right in their view of the matter, and even if mistaken, their motives were good. They may have thought that a creed departing as little as possible from the very words of Scripture would have more weight with heretics and others than one of which the phraseology was altogether human; and I judge that they thought so because it was an objection of the opponents of the Athanasian party that even the ὁμοούσιον was a new phrase not found in Scripture, and Eusebius himself tells us that he the more readily assented to the anathematising Arius because the phrases he used concerning the Son of God were nowhere to be found in Scripture. And if they thought so I do not see that subsequent events have not justified their thought; because no doubt the phraseology of the Athanasian creed, powerful and accurate as it is, has had a tendency to provoke dissent from those who in matters of faith and mystery are more disposed to bow to the authority of the word of God than to that of the Church. Evidently, too, the tacit adoption of the Athanasian Creed, as a further development of the Catholic faith, by the whole Western Church, instead of abiding by the finality of the Nicene Creed, facilitated the introduction of new articles of faith at Trent, and at Rome under Pius IX.; which would have been impossible had the Nicene Creed been still considered as the final expression of the Church's faith, in accordance with the judgment of Athanasius. However, what I would insist upon is that it is at least possible that the view of the councils and of St. Athanasius was a right one, and that it is not fair to tax those who share it with being Socinians, or latitudinarians, or enemies of the faith.

II. The second point is the propriety or expediency of the damnatory clauses. Now, to hear the language of some of

their defenders, one would think that the notion of a creed without the support of an anathema against all who did not accept every statement of that creed was in itself a heresy, and a thing utterly unknown to the Church. But what are the historical facts? The Council of Nice put forth their creed, the faith of the Catholic Church. They simply recited the articles of belief which, as Eusebius writes, they had received from the bishops who preceded them, which they had been taught as catechumens, which they had professed at their baptism, which they had learnt out of Holy Scripture, and which both as priests and bishops they had ever taught; only with the addition of the *δμοούστιον* (*of one substance*). And then, having declared the Catholic faith, they added, *after the exposition of the faith* (*μετὰ τὴν πίστιν*), the anathemas against the various heretical sayings of Arius and his companions. "Those who say that there was a time when Christ was not, or that He is of a different substance from the Father, or that He was created," and so on, "the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematises." And so the succeeding Councils. They promulgated and confirmed the Nicene Creed, but they introduced no threats of damnation against those who did not accept it. There was the creed in its simple majesty. So has the Church received the faith, so does the Church hold it, so does the Church teach it. And when the creed came to be used as a part of the office of the Church, it was recited in its simplicity without anathema and without threat. The Church was content that it should be so for at least 600 years. Why, then, should we now depart from the Catholic usage of so many centuries, and both use a new creed and intertwine the profession of our own faith with the condemnation of all who in the smallest point differ from it?

These, my Reverend Brethren, are some of the considerations which have occurred to me in connection with this difficult and perplexing question. I do not give them as conclusive upon

the subject, but I venture to commend them to your calm reflection.

Turning next to a different class of subjects, I wish to say a few words on the vital question of elementary education. The persistent and vehement effort that has been and is still being made to deprive the children of England of a religious education is one of the greatest portents of the age. Should it succeed I do not think any one living can calculate the disastrous consequences to our native land. In spite of the irreligion and the immorality which so often shock us both in town and country, there is a great amount of religious knowledge,—knowledge of Scripture, of the Church Catechism, of the Ten Commandments, of Prayers and Hymns,—diffused amongst our people, which has, at different times of their life, and under various circumstances, upon the whole, an enormous influence. This is due to our schools, and to nothing but our schools. The attempt to deprive the children of our working classes of this immense blessing, whatever be the motives of those engaged in it, I look upon as one of the wickedest enterprises ever undertaken by a large party in a Christian land. That any man who believes the Gospel, or who believes in God, can stand up and look at the 20,000 or 30,000 schools in England, where the children of the less favoured classes are receiving that Christian training which alone can supply them with guidance and with comfort in the future trials of life, and then form the resolution, “I will leave no stone unturned to deprive every one of those children of the religious training which they now have,” is, to my mind, an inconceivable cruelty. And for men to band themselves together in leagues and societies to make it impossible for poor members of the Church of England to have their children brought up in the faith which they love and believe, is an act of tyranny and oppression more fit for old Spain under the Inquisition, or the Spanish Netherlands, than for a land of freedom and toleration like England. It strikes

me, too, as an ungrateful return for the conscience clause which was conceded by the Church to the Non-Conformists. It is for you, the laity of the Church of England, to resist this iniquitous attempt, and to aid your clergy to the utmost of your power to maintain that system of elementary Education by which, with perfect respect to the rights of conscience in others, religious education according to the tenets of the Church of England shall be secured to the Church children in every parish in the land. And you must begin each with his own parish. It will require an effort, doubtless, and a measure of self-sacrifice. But the object is worth an effort, and worth a sacrifice too. If others are strong in the attack of our most cherished institutions, you must be strong in their defence. Hitherto we have kept rate schools out of the Diocese with tolerable success, which implies the adequate enlargement and improvement of our Church schools. I find that, from 1870 to March 1873, not less than £2632 have been voted in eighty-one several grants from the special Fund and the Diocesan Board Fund to assist in enabling schools to meet the requirements of the Government, implying an outlay of £40,000 at least, besides the numerous schools which the landed proprietors built or enlarged at their own cost. I do not think there are six rate-supported schools in the whole Diocese as yet. But I am afraid of their increase. It is more difficult to keep up the steady annual subscriptions for the schools than to make one effort to build them. And then if one or two parishioners refuse to subscribe to the denominational school, the others feel it hard to pay extra because some do not pay at all, and there is a great temptation to say, We will have a Rate, and then all must pay alike. I ask you, my lay brethren, to resist this temptation. Remember that a School-rate means, in the long run, no Religion in the school, that it means, in the long run, down with the Church of England, and, in the future, an infidel population.

In order, however, that our Church schools may hold their ground and supply the Educational religious wants of the people, it is absolutely necessary that they be good and efficient schools. Hence we have felt the necessity of supplying, what the Government Inspector is no longer permitted to supply, inspection in religious knowledge, and for this end a paid Diocesan Inspector. The Rev. William Michell was appointed by me Diocesan Inspector of Schools, and has entered upon his second year of office. I have heard but one opinion as to the value and excellent effect of this inspection from those whose schools Mr. Michell has visited, and there is every hope that the prize scheme which is being organised will tend to give a most useful stimulus to both teachers and scholars. I earnestly ask the steady assistance of the laity to maintain the fund for the payment of the Diocesan Inspector. It has been an immense aid to the efficiency of the scheme that the unpaid inspectors have continued their labours in connection with Mr. Michell ; and I beg to tender them my cordial thanks for their most useful and efficient assistance, without which we should have been in a fix.

I have spoken of the danger of an infidel population. The fearful growth of infidelity is one of the most alarming signs of the times. Together with much earnest and serious religion, there is a terrible increase of unblushing, boasting, unbelief and atheism. Men of science, scholars, members of Parliament, as well as large sections of the lower classes in London and our great towns, are professed infidels. The press teems with infidel publications, and in what is called society in London Christianity is often openly run down. The fruits of infidelity are sure to follow : anarchy, corruption of morals, and crime. When the restraining and enlightening power of the fear of God is removed from the mind and heart of men demoralisation is very rapid. The great French Revolution was a memorable instance. We all know how bloodshed, lust,

and resistance to all government, sprang up, under the influence of atheism, with rank luxuriance. It will be so in England to a certainty if atheism obtains a solid footing among us. Almighty God prevent it by the Power of His Holy Spirit! But we, my Reverend Brethren, must do our part. It will be well for those among us who have the ability to direct our studies this way, so as to be able to meet the intellectual difficulties of our misguided brethren, and to refute their arguments, and to fortify the faith of our own flocks. Especially should we be careful not to load Christianity with difficulties which do not really belong to it: not to broach as revealed Truth what is really only a figment of men: not to exalt faith at the expense of reason: not to cultivate a superstitious turn of mind. I have often thought that one of the heaviest charges that can be brought against the Church of Rome is the immense encouragement she has given to infidelity by her system of lying wonders. By setting before the minds of her people as truths of Christianity, traditions, legends, miracles, impostures, doctrines, hopes, promises, which have no truth in them, she may have deluded many into a superstitious belief, but she has made among thinking men an infinite number of infidels. Look at France, Spain, Italy! When men find out that they have been deceived, that their teachers have taught them lies for truth, that what had been given to them as doctrines from Heaven were the corrupt inventions of deceived or interested men, they are very apt to fall into scepticism, and to reject truth along with error. Pious frauds, and craft, and contrivance, never succeed in the long run: they do worse than not succeed: they endanger the very truths which they are intended to support. It should therefore be a prime object with every true minister of God's word to teach as truth nothing but what is certainly true. We have no need, and we have no right, to handle the word of God deceitfully. By manifestation of the truth, and the truth only, to every man's conscience, we can best advance the work of

God. The Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, too, addresses itself to the intellect as much as to the sentiments and affection of man. Beware of addressing the *αἰσθησίς*, the sense, only or mainly, lest when the hay and stubble is burnt there remain nothing solid and durable behind.

But there is another thing which I wish to say in connection with the infidelity, the waxing, strengthening infidelity, of which we now see, I fear, the beginning only. How immensely important it is that, in the face of such an invasion, Christians should be united. While we are wrangling about the vainest trifles, the very foundations, not of Christianity alone but of all religion are being attacked by the apostles of atheism. In the face of such a danger the Church must be united if she would be strong. It is not a question of copes or no copes, candles or no candles, water in the chalice or no water, but Christ or no Christ, God or no God, Eternal life, or the dog's death. Let those who hold the great truths be united, and let them be careful not to put stumbling-blocks in their brothers' way. It is surely not an unreasonable hope that in the face of the great danger of infidelity some—nay, many—of our Non-Conformist brethren who have been separated from us by trivial differences, may be disposed to return to the Church of their fathers, and join us in the great struggle against the tyranny of secularism. We need, therefore, be very careful not to raise needless obstacles to their return.

Looking back at the time that has elapsed since my last visitation, I find that besides the outlay for schools above referred to, twenty-three grants for church restoration, or building, have been made by the Diocesan Board, amounting in the aggregate to £1580, and representing an expenditure of above £35,000. I have assisted at the opening, after restoration of some kind, of about thirty-three churches.

Besides the ordinary work of the Diocese, I have thought that missions, of which I had some experience in the Diocese

of Ely, might be advantageously introduced among us. I have accordingly given such help as I was able to give to missions, first at Taunton and the neighbourhood, then at Wells and Glastonbury, and last Advent at Yeovil and the neighbourhood. I think they were productive generally of marked good results. The services were very well attended, and in many instances by persons who were seldom or never seen in church, and interest was aroused in the great subject of Christianity. If health and strength are given to me, I hope from time to time to hold missions in other parts of the Diocese, and especially in the towns, the populations of which are more apt to escape the ordinary parochial ministrations than those of the country. I shall be truly obliged to any of my brethren who will organise a good mission, and call me in to assist in it.

I may also mention in this connection a series of sermons on infidelity preached at the Abbey Church at Bath last autumn, and organised by the Rector of Bath. I am told they produced a considerable impression, and regret that they were not published.

I put into an appendix the returns of the number of communicants extracted from the Rural Dean's returns, and also of the number of persons confirmed, and I take this opportunity of returning my warm thanks to the Rural Deans for their invaluable services. They have the thanks, too, I am sure, of the whole Diocese.

Looking back at the agreeable incidents of the past year (and I shall not allude to any disagreeable ones—requiescant in pace), I would single out the observance in this Diocese of the 20th December as a day of intercessory prayer on behalf of missions. The observance exceeded my most sanguine anticipations. I believe there was scarcely a parish where it was not observed somehow, and in a vast number of parishes the observance was of a very marked and earnest kind. As an evidence of this I may mention that there were applied for of the

Private Prayers and Meditations prepared by me 25,466, of which unfortunately we were only able to supply 8000 copies. Of the pastoral addresses 10,030 were applied for, and 2500 were supplied. Of the special services for the Diocese of Bath and Wells 38,200 were supplied, and in addition to these many of the services for the Diocese of Canterbury were used in the Diocese, of which I have no return.

I hope that my brethren of the clergy will not let the interest die away among their parishioners. I shall be very glad to receive any suggestions as to the best way of keeping alive this interest and turning it to account in the support of our great missionary societies.

Looking forward to the future, whatever difficulties or trials may be in store for us, I trust that the Bishop and Clergy and Laity of this Diocese will ever be found working lovingly together hand in hand, and standing in the very front of the battle against infidelity, worldliness, and sin. Let us of the clergy especially remember that our Lord has given us a great work to do for His glory, and the weal of His Church. Our pleasant palaces and our comfortable parsonage-houses, and our endowments, great or small, are not given us that we may lounge away our time easily and without care, but that we may be able to give ourselves up entirely to our Master's service, and to the service of His dear spouse the Church. Can there be a nobler work entrusted to any child of man, than that of reclaiming his fellow-men from sin and death, and diffusing around him, by word and by example, the glorious light of the Gospel of Christ? But when we look our work in the face, even in a country like England, where Christianity has so long been established, it seems almost hopeless, and beyond the strength of man to accomplish. And so it is. "Who is sufficient for these things?" When we think of the ignorance which has to be pierced through before the sword of the spirit pricks the heart, when we think of the inveterate habits of sin

—drunkenness, lust, dishonesty, lawlessness,—which have to be displaced ; when we think of the sluggishness, the lethargy, the carelessness, the indifference to spiritual things, which have to be attacked and routed ; when we think of the sturdy worldliness, the covetousness, the carnal-mindedness, which have to be forced aside for the love of Christ to enter in, and of the opposition and contradiction and resistance which have to be encountered by those who preach God's Word fearlessly and faithfully, we might well shrink from the task which belongs to us, if we did not remember who it is that says to us, “ My grace is sufficient for thee.” But remembering this we do not shrink, and with God's help we never will draw back, till we have finished our course with joy, and the ministry which we have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God. And you, my brethren of the laity, will I hope give us your countenance and help. You will work with us and for us in your proper sphere, and so shall the pleasure of the Lord prosper in our hands. Labouring through good report and through evil report, in sunshine and in storm, we shall at least be witnesses for Christ in our day and generation. But haply we shall be more than witnesses. God will perhaps vouchsafe so to bless and own our several ministrations, that I in my Diocese, and you, dear brethren, in your several parishes, shall have much people to be our joy and crown of rejoicing at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. And so, when those unhappy men who made shipwreck of their faith, and denied the Lord who bought them, shall be overwhelmed with shame in the presence of the Lord when He comes in His Glory, we, if by His grace we have been steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord—we, I say, shall be unspeakably blessed, for we shall take our several places in the glorified Church of God, and shall ever be with our Lord.

## APPENDIX.

---

P. 11, l. i.—It is difficult, if not impossible, to express condemnation of the practice, so alien to the English Church, of adoring the Sacrament, in language that will not provoke the cavils of those who practise it. But the truth is that they who contend for a literal interpretation of our Lord's words, This is my Body, and yet indignantly deny that they worship the Bread, or what seems to be the Bread, are most inconsistent. If the Bread and Wine set on the Lord's Table *ARE* the Body and Blood of the Lord (in the full sense which such predication is capable of conveying and without *any* limitation) and if the Body and Blood of the Lord are proper objects of worship, it inevitably follows that the Bread and Wine ought to be worshipped. There is no possible escape from this conclusion.

But when those whose instincts shrink from worshipping the elements seek to justify the adoration which they offer (as they say) *towards* the elements, as the locality within the limits of which Christ's Presence is situate, they are forced to invent a new phraseology which has no warrant whatever, as to its words or its sense, in Holy Scripture, and which involves a wide departure from the literal meaning of the words which are the foundation of the whole theory. For our Lord did not say I am in the Bread, or, under the Bread, or, my Presence is in the Bread, but, This is my Body. To speak of an objective Presence of Christ, or a real Presence of Christ, in the elements, and of such a Presence distinct from the elements, as an object of worship, is a purely human interpretation, and is as much an explaining away of the literal meaning of the words 'This is my Body' as the Zuinglian or any other explanation is.

But if it is sought to justify such phrases, and the consequent worship of Christ in the elements, by the language or practice of the

early Church, such an attempt is an absolute failure, because it is PERFECTLY CERTAIN that during the three first centuries at least—one might say eight or ten centuries—worship was not given to the elements, or to any Presence of Christ in the elements. The acknowledged silence of the Liturgies is conclusive on the point. It is absolutely impossible that both in their language, and in the minute rubrical directions which they contain, a complete silence in regard to such worship should be maintained, if it had been the practice of the Church to render it. It is equally impossible that not one single allusion to such worship should be found in any writer for the first three centuries and upwards, if during those centuries the elements, or Christ's Presence in the elements, were habitually adored.

To confound the adoration of our Lord in Heaven, which the thankful remembrance of His death in the Holy Eucharist must call forth in every devout communicant, with the adoration of the Sacrament itself, as Mr. Keble does in his singularly weak and painful work on Eucharistical Adoration, is the part either of a very confused intellect, or of a very unfair controversialist.

I have said that there is absolutely no trace of adoration of the Sacrament in the three first centuries and upwards. Late in the fourth century we can perceive an incipient change in the language used in regard to the Eucharist: a growing tendency to use inflated and exaggerated language, which culminated in the doctrine of transubstantiation as decreed by the Fourth Lateran Council A.D. 1215, and in the elevation and worship of the Host which came in about the same time. The Arian controversy had probably something to do with this change. The ancient simple forms, and the simple language of ancient Creeds and Liturgies, were deemed insufficient to express the Incarnation and Deity of the Lord Jesus. And so a new doctrine of the Eucharist was developed, and about the same time, and for the same purpose, a new doctrine concerning the Blessed Virgin, "the Mother of God," was brought in, to the great injury of the Church, and of the Gospel of which she was the guardian. But a careful consideration of the passages adduced by Mr. Keble will show how weak the evidence is even in those later centuries. The passage from Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cateches. Mystagog.* v. xviii, xix.), taken in connection with the whole Catechesis is decisive evidence against adoration. Because the form of the Catechesis, which is a

recapitulation of all that was done at the Eucharist—the Prayers, the actions, the rubrical directions of the deacons,—makes it simply impossible that if so important an action as the adoration of the Sacrament was performed, the mention of it should be omitted. Now, in the account of receiving the Bread (Sect. xviii.) there is no mention of the kind ; and in the account of receiving the cup (Sect. xix.) what is said is not the least more than might be said to an English communicant : “ After you have communicated in the Body of Christ, draw near to the cup of His Blood, not stretching out your hands, but inclining (*κύπτων*) yourself, and saying AMEN, adoringly and reverentially (*τρόπῳ προσκυνησέως καὶ σεβάσματος*).” The almost duplicate passages from St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, are the only ones which at all favour Mr. Keble’s views. The two authors are expounding Ps. xcix. 5, after their fashion, and are puzzled by the LXX. version, *προσκυνεῖτε τῷ ἵποποδίῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ*, which they understand to mean *Worship His Footstool*. The explanation given is that God’s footstool is *the earth* (Isai. lxvi. 1), and that *the earth* means “ the Flesh of Christ, which to this day we adore in the mysteries ;” or, as St. Augustine has it, “ He gave that Flesh to us to eat . . . and no one eateth that Flesh unless he hath first worshipped.” But though these expressions would fall in very well with “ sacramental adoration,” if it could be shown from other quarters to have prevailed at that time, they are manifestly insufficient, isolated as they are, to prove it. They would find an adequate explanation in the adoration that every devout communicant must needs pay to our Lord at the time of celebrating “ the mysteries,” and in that confession of the Godhead of Christ which is a necessary qualification for worthy Communion.

I may add that the above singular exposition of Ps. xcix. 5, by two such eminent fathers as Ambrose and Augustine, may well teach us caution in deferring too much to single expressions. Moreover, Cyril of Jerusalem’s language concerning the conversion of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ must be qualified by the language which he uses of meats offered to idols, and concerning chrism. “ For as the Bread and the Wine of the Eucharist before the holy invocation of the adorable Trinity were mere bread and wine, but after the invocation the Bread becomes the Body of Christ and the Wine His Blood, in like wise such meats being in their own nature mere meats (*λιτὰ ὄντα*) by the invocation of

devils become abominable ( $\betaέ\betaηλα$ )” *Cat. Myst.* i. sec. 4. Concerning chrism he says, “ See that you do not consider it as bare oil ( $\psiιλὸν$ ). For as the Bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Spirit is no longer mere bread ( $\lambdaιτός$ ) but the Body of Christ, so also this Holy ointment is no longer bare or, so to speak, common ointment, after the Invocation, but the gift ( $χάρισμα$ ) of Christ, and that which by the presence of the Holy Ghost works in you the participation of His divine Nature ( $Θεότητος$ ) . . . The body indeed is anointed with the ointment, but the soul is sanctified by the Holy Life-giving Spirit,” iii. 3.

P. 11, l. 5.—Confession and Absolution in the Church of the first seven or eight centuries were public acts in the face of the congregation, and formed part of the public discipline of the Church. They related to grave offences, such as lapse into idolatry, murder, adultery, or the like. Private confession, as in the Church of England, was exceptional; and it was not followed by absolution, but by “ghostly counsel and advice”: as in the pseudo-Epistle of Clement of Rome to St. James, it is said, “ut ab ipso (the Priest) per verbum Dei et consilium salubre curetur:” which seems to be the original of the phrase in the first exhortation in the office for the Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer. Confession was made obligatory by the Fourth Lateran Council, A.D. 1215. Thus those who are endeavouring to force auricular confession upon the Anglican Church are bringing in not a Catholic but a Romish usage.

*Ib.* l. 6.—Purgatory. Of course this is not meant of the private speculations of Origen and others, but of Church doctrine.

*Ib.* l. 24.—Offices, &c. The *Priest's Prayer Book* and the *Directorium Anglicanum* are the two books referred to here and at p. 12. Since this Charge was delivered I have become acquainted with another book of the same kind, “The English Catholic's *Vade Mecum*,” *bound up with the Book of Common Prayer*. In the Preface the compiler recommends that “a picture or figure of the Crucifixion, Christ in His Mother's arms, &c.” be placed in the room used for Prayers, and that the Office “be said all kneeling or standing with their faces turned *towards the sacred object mentioned*.” He notes that “it has become so customary among English Catholics to insert the names of Blessed Mary and all saints in the *Confiteor*,” that it is inserted in his book. Accordingly we read at p. 2, “I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary, and to all saints that I have sinned

exceedingly, &c. Wherefore I beg that Blessed Mary and all saints may pray to the Lord our God for me." At p. 11, "Let the intercession of St. Mary and all Thy saints assist us to obtain help and salvation from Thee, O Lord." At p. 14, s. 99, is given a method of "assisting at . . . the Holy Communion commonly called The Mass . . . for hearers," *i.e.*, for non-communicants. "I appear before Thee to offer unto Thee by the hands of Thy Priest the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in union with the sacrifice offered by the same our Lord at the last Supper and upon the Altar of the Cross: 1. To the glory of Thy Name, &c. 5. For the remission of the sins of all Christians, living or dead." At p. 17, "Reverencing the memory of the glorious and ever-virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ, and of Thy Blessed Apostles and Martyrs, and of all Thy Saints, by whose good deeds and prayers grant that we may be defended, &c." At p. 30. Examination of conscience. 1. *Sins against God*. . . . Have I broken my fast before Communion? . . . 3. Have I performed my last penance?" P. 39. "O my Jesus grant that all Thy blessed angels and saints, and, above all, Thy glorious Mother, the ever-virgin Mary, who face to face behold Thee . . . may bestow upon me the assistance of their prayers and intercessions, &c." P. 42. In a hymn to "the Blessed Sacrament" we read, "Had I but Mary's sinless heart, to love Thee with, my dearest King, &c." and the *refrain* of the Hymn is "Sweet Sacrament we Thee adore! Oh make us love Thee more and more." P. 53. "I thank Thee, Divine Priest, for that every day Thou dost offer Thyself upon our altars, in adoration and homage to the most Blessed Trinity." Pp. 61, 62, Litany of the saints and angels, "By the glory Thou bestowest upon her (Mary) in Heaven, by her prayers and intercessions . . . By their (the saints) continual prayers and intercessions . . . Good Lord deliver us . . . That it may please Thee to aid and defend us by the Prayers and Intercessions of the Holy Mother of God . . . to grant us to receive benefit from the prayers of Thy blessed Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins and of all saints." P. 68. Litany of the most Holy Sacrament. "Perpetual sacrifice, Pure oblation, . . . Supernatural Bread, Word made Flesh, Sacred Victim, Chalice of Benediction, . . . most high and adorable Sacrament, most holy of all Sacrifices, True Propitiation for the living and the dead, Bread made Flesh . . . have mercy upon us." Pp. 77, 78. "Rosary of the most Holy Name of Jesus. The five

mysteries of the first part." At the mention of each mystery *Jesus Son of David have mercy upon us*, is directed to be repeated ten times—in all fifty times! Then follow the mysteries of the second and third part, each followed by an invocation to be repeated ten times—in all one hundred times! At p. 83. "Prayers to the five wounds," each Prayer followed by *Our Father*, and "*Hail Mary*." P. 108. Feast of our Lady. "It is meet that with joyful minds we should bless, praise, and magnify Thee on this commemoration of the Blessed and glorious ever-virgin, &c. Blessed is the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, . . . lo she is exalted above the quires of angels, there may she pray for us to the Lord our God." P. 114. A hymn "to the Holy Mother of God." "Ave Maria, Blessed Maid, &c." Another, "None can hope a worthy anthem to that Virgin's name to raise," &c. P. 117. Hymn "to all angels." "Let Mary, Mother of our God, be o'er us, all round about us be the angel chorus, &c." P. 120. "Let Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of death." P. 143. "The Angelus. N.B.—It is a common custom among Catholics to recite the following prayers thrice a day. . . The angel of the Lord, &c. Hail Mary. Behold the Handmaid of the Lord, &c. Hail Mary. And the Word was made Flesh, &c. Hail Mary."

These are a few specimens of "Catholic" teaching. The reader will judge whether I have spoken too severely of the attempt to bring back the doctrines of the Church of Rome.

P. 16, l. 18.—The Church's definition of a sacrament is conclusive against her holding the notion of an objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Bread and Wine apart from reception. A sacrament is defined to be "an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace given unto us;" i.e., it is a sign of something which is internal to ourselves: a real thing, no doubt, most real, but inward; something which we feed upon in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving. The Bread and Wine are the outward, visible sign, the Body and Blood of Christ, as the food and sustenance of the soul, are the inward spiritual grace. That which is on the Paten, or in the hands, is not inward. And therefore the 28th Article most truly declares that *Transubstantiation. . . overthroweth the nature of a sacrament*. And so, for the very same reason, does the doctrine of the objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Bread and Wine apart from reception.

P. 16, l. 33.—In the *Ordo Romanus* the Priest prays thus: Suscipe Sancte Pater . . . hanc immaculatam Hostiam, quam ego indignus famulus tuus offero tibi Deo meo vivo et vero pro innumerabilibus peccatis et offenditibus et negligentiis meis . . . et pro omnibus fidelibus Christianis vivis atque defunctis. And again after consecration, Offerimus præclaræ majestati tuæ de tuis donis ac datis Hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, &c. Still on the whole it is most remarkable how little in the service itself is said directly of the sacrifice as being a propitiatory sacrifice, or as being the offering up of Christ, doubtless because the ancient Liturgies are in the main adhered to. But in the acts of the Council of Trent the language is very different. Thus in the Acts of the 22nd Session, Cap. ii., we read Quoniam in divino hoc sacrificio . . . idem ille Christus continetur, et in cruento immolatur, qui in ara crucis seipsum cruento obtulit, docet sancta Synodus sacrificium istud vere propitiatorium esse . . . Quare non solum pro fidelium vivorum peccatis . . . sed et pro defunctis . . . offertur. Again in the first Canon *de Sacrificio Missæ*. Si quis dixerit in Missa non offerri Deo verum sacrificium . . . anathema sit. Can. ii. Si quis dixerit Christum non instituisse apostolos sacerdotes . . . ut offerrent corpus et sanguinem suum; anathema sit. Can. iii. Si quis dixerit, Missæ sacrificium tantum esse . . . nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti, neque pro vivis et defunctis . . . offerri debere; anathema sit. And in the following decree, the mass is described as tremendum mysterium, quo vivifica illa hostia, qua Deo Patri reconciliati sumus, in altari per sacerdotes quotidie immolatur. So again in the 1st Canon *de Sacramento Ordinis*. Si quis dixerit . . . non esse potestatem (for Priests) consecrandi et offerendi verum corpus et sanguinem Domini . . . anathema sit.

In the Catechism, Quæst. LXXVI., we read—Sine ullâ dubitatione docendum est . . . sacrosanctum missæ sacrificium esse non solum . . . nudam commemorationem sacrificii quod in cruce factum est, sed veré propitiatorium sacrificium quo Deus placatus et propitius redditur. And Quæstio LXXVII. explains that it is a Propitiation for the sins of the quick and the dead.

P. 18, l. 4.—Mr. Keble fully admits that “ the primitive Liturgies are almost or altogether silent as to any worship of Christ’s Body and Blood after consecration. We find in them neither

any form of prayer addressed in speial to His holy Humanity so present, nor any rubric enjoining adoration inward or outward." Euchar. Ador. p. 114. But the Roman Canon is full of rubrics enjoining such adoration. Thus in the Prayer of Consecration after the words *Hoc est enim Corpus meum*, the rubric says, *Statim Hostiam consecratam genuflexus adorat, surgit, ostendit populo . . . iterum adorat*. Again after the words *in mei memoriam facietis*, the rubric says, *Genuflexus adorat . . . ostendit populo . . . et iterum adorat*. And repeatedly the direction is given *Genuflectit*. The absence of any such rubrics, amidst the copious rubries of the old Liturgies, is a distinct proof of the absence of such adoration in the early Church, and a proof that those who are introducing these genuflexions and prostrations into our English service are introducing Popish corruptions, not Catholie usages.

*Ib. l. 11.*—I have condensed the account given by Justin Martyr till I come to the important words *which Bread and Wine* down to the *Incarnate Jesus*, which I have rendered into English as faithfully as I could. The Greek runs thus: οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὃν τροπὸν διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτὸν εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν (ἔξ οὗ αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν) ἐκείνον τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι, where the comparison of the change of the food eaten into the flesh and blood of the eater by assimilation (*κατὰ μεταβολὴν*) manifestly suggests that the sacramental Bread and Wine are changed into the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ by an analogous process of spiritual assimilation, when we 'feed upon Him in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving.' I can conceive no other reason than this for the mention of the conversion of food into the flesh and blood of the eater. In one case by being eaten the bread becomes his own flesh, in the other it becomes the flesh of Christ. The phrase *τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτὸν εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν* is somewhat obscure. It might be rendered *the prayer of the Word which came from the Father*, i.e., the Blessing and thanksgiving which Christ pronounced when He instituted the Holy Eucharist.

I ought to have added in the text that this passage of Justin Martyr is also a demonstration that in his time the Church did not adore the Bread and Wine, or Christ as in, or under, the Bread and Wine.

P. 19.—The testimony of Eusebius is taken entirely from the First Book of the *Demonstratio Evangelica*. The exact words of the passage referred to in 1. 15 are as follows. He is expounding Ps. xl., 6—9, and says that the Psalmist thus plainly teaches that in lieu of the old sacrifices and burnt offerings Christ offered His own Body to God. He then adds, “*We who have received according to the laws of the New Testament an injunction to celebrate the memory of this Sacrifice at a Table, by means of the symbols of His Body and of His saving Blood, are instructed by the Prophet David to say Thou hast prepared a table before me, &c., where the mystic chrism and the awful sacrifices of Christ's Table are plainly signified; through which having certainty of acceptance* (δι' ὃν καλλιεροῦντες) *we are instructed to offer to God during our whole lives the unbloody and reasonable sacrifices which are well-pleasing to Him, through the supreme High Priest of all.*” It should be observed that in all the earlier writers “the reasonable and unbloody sacrifice” and “the pure offering,” are spoken of the sacrifice of Prayer and thanksgiving, and of a contrite heart, not of the offering of the Bread and Wine of the Holy Eucharist. It must also be borne in mind that in the language used by Eusebius and others, there is a constant reference to the words of the Prophets, especially to Malachi i. 2. This will be clearly seen in the last passage quoted in p. 19, from the close of the first Book of the *Demonst. Evangel.*

P. 24.—The passage from Ceillier's *Anteurs Ecclesiastiques* will be found at Volume v. p. 292.

P. 26.—The account of the Nicene Creed in the preceding pages is taken mainly from Socrates' *Ecclesiast. Hist.*, Lib. I.

P. 28, l. 22.—I only know of four places where Church schools have been superseded by Rate Schools. School Boards have been established in four other places, but the Church Schools have not been superseded.

I subjoin a Table furnished by the Diocesan Inspector, the Rev. W. Michell, giving a summary of Inspections, and of the numbers of children, and the state of the schools in the Diocese for the year 1872.

DIOCESE OF BATH AND WELLS—1872.  
PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

P. 31, l. 32.—The Consecrations of Churches and Burial Grounds have been as under:—

CONSECRATIONS FROM 21ST DECEMBER, 1869, TO PRESENT TIME.

Consecrations of Churches and Burial-grounds.	Consecrations of Churches.	Consecrations of Cemeteries.	Consecrations of additional Burial-grounds under "The Consecration of Churchyards Act, 1867."
1870.	1870.	1870.	1870.
Corton Denham. . . . 1	Combe Wick. . . . 1	Walcot, Bath . . . . 1	Martock . . . . 1
Walton in Gordano . . . . 1	1871.	Freshford . . . . 1	Cloford . . . . 1
Bathwick, St. John's . . . . 1			Curry Rivell. . . . 1
All Saints, Yeovil Marsh . . . . 1			Kelston . . . . 1
			1871.
			Pilton . . . . 1
			Barrington . . . . 1
			1872.
			Walton in Gordano . . . . 1
			Dinder . . . . 1
			Long Ashton . . . . 1
			Henstridge . . . . 1
			West Coker . . . . 1
Total . . . . 2	Total . . . . 3	Total . . . . 2	Total . . . . 11

P. 32, l. 20.—The returns of Communicants, which must only be taken as approximate, for the different Deaneries, are as follows. The Table also shows the condition of the Churches.

	Churches in good state.	Churches in bad state.	Number of Communicants in 1869.	Number of Communicants in 1872.
Axbridge Deanery .	39	2	1732	1628
Bath .	44	0	2039	2247
Bridgwater .	34	3	713	738
Cary .	50	4	1478	1383
Chew .	42	3	1137	1249
Crewkerne .	40	2	1541	1357
Dunster .	43	4	1135	1040
Frome .	54	1	1476	1248
Glastonbury .	17	4	867	1035
Ilchester .	32	3	897	829
Merston .	21	7	730	741
Pawlet .	6	2	186	160
Taunton .	46	3	1703	1858
Total. . .	468	38	15,634	15,513

The number of persons confirmed was—

	Males.	Females.	Missing Return.	Total.
In 1870 . . . . .	1619	2458	59	4136
,, 1871 . . . . .	1923	2515	2	4440
,, 1872 . . . . .	1785	1855	—	3640
Total since last Visitation.	5327	6828	61	12,216

## ECCLESIASTICAL DILAPIDATIONS ACT, 1871.

### DIOCESE OF BATH AND WELLS.

*Orders to inspect issued up to the 31st December, 1872.*

On complaint . . . . .	1
At the request of the incumbent . . . . .	12
On Motion of the Bishop . . . . .	4
On vacancy . . . . .	39
	—
	56

## COLLECTIONS

AT THE OFFERTORY DURING THE VISITATION, GIVEN TO THE  
CURATES' AUGMENTATION FUND.









